



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,211	02/12/2002	Paul Trpkovski	44046.103.203.21.2	9015
22859	7590	05/18/2006	EXAMINER A, PHI DIEU TRAN	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP FREDRIKSON & BYRON, P.A. 200 SOUTH SIXTH STREET SUITE 4000 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ART UNIT 3637	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/076,211

Applicant(s)

TRPKOVSKI, PAUL

Examiner

Phi D. A

Art Unit

3637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6,8-12,48-51 and 55-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6,8-12,48-51,55-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

*With respect to the limitation of “glazing compound” in claims 1, 6, 8-12, the limitation is not claimed and is thus treated accordingly as a subcombination with the other claimed structures.*

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 6, 12, 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams Jr. (5866260) in view of Calabrese (2657795) and Hurst (3900102).

Adams Jr. et al shows a transparent window pane (18) having first and second generally opposed major surfaces (20, 21) being sized and shaped to be mounted in a frame configured to received at least one edge of the pane (figures 5b, 6b), the pane having a removable protective covering (22) disposed over a central portion of the first surface and that extend across a length of the first surface or across a width of said surface, the central portion spanning at least 70% of the first surface, the first surface having an unmasked peripheral apron, the masking material being a transparent film (col 3 line 45), the unmasked apron extends between an outer periphery of the protective covering and an outer periphery of the pane, the covering being attached to the first major surface by masking adhesive (inherently being masking adhesive as the adhesive is made to be removed with the masking cover), the masking material being translucent or transparent (col 3 lines 44-45).

Adams Jr. et al does not show the protective covering having a plurality of strips of masking material that are disposed over a central portion of the first surface, the strips of masking material being disposed in a sequentially overlapping fashion with each subsequent strip overlapping a portion of a preceding strip, the strips extending substantially in parallel across the first surface of the pane, the strips being adhesively attached to the first major surface by a masking adhesive, the overlapped strips of masking film defining a plurality of exposed lateral edges that form readily accessible means, the strips are affixed to one another by adhesive.

Hurst discloses a plurality of sequentially overlapping strips covering a large central portion of a first surface of a structure, the strips are to sealed surfaces sound in buildings and civil engineering structures (col 1 lines 14-16), the strips are affixed to one another by adhesive, the strips extending substantially parallel across a first surface of the structure, the strips defining a plurality of exposed lateral edges.

Calabrese discloses a protective covering having a plurality of strips (12-14) of masking material covering an area to be left unpainted.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams Jr. et al to show the protective covering having a plurality of strips of masking material that are disposed over a central portion of the first surface as taught by Calabrese, the strips of masking material being disposed in a sequentially overlapping fashion with each subsequent strip overlapping a portion of a preceding strip, the strips extending substantially in parallel across the first surface of the pane, the strips being adhesively attached to the first major surface by a masking adhesive, the overlapped strips of masking film defining a plurality of exposed lateral edges that form readily accessible means, the strips are affixed to one

Art Unit: 3637

another by adhesive as taught by Hurst because having the multiple strips of masking material disposed over a large central portion of a first surface would protect the central portion of the structure from being painted thereon as taught by Calabrese, and having the strips extending substantially in parallel across the first surface of the pane, the strips being adhesively attached to the first major surface by a masking adhesive, the overlapped strips of masking film defining a plurality of exposed lateral edges that form readily accessible means, the strips affixed to one another by adhesive would allow for the formation of a continuous membrane over the whole surface as taught by Hurst.

3. Claims 1, 6, 12, 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagashima et al (6461736) in view of Adams Jr. (5866260).

Nagashima et al shows a transparent window pane (2, figures 1-2) having first and second generally opposed major surfaces being sized and shaped to be mounted in a frame configured to received at least one edge of the pane, the pane having a removable protective covering (5, 4, 3) disposed over a central portion of the first surface and that extend across a length of the first surface or across a width of said surface, the central portion spanning at least 70% of the first surface, the protective covering having a plurality of strips (5, 4, 3) of masking material that are disposed over a central portion of the first surface, the strips being disposed in a sequentially overlapping fashion with each subsequent strip overlapping a portion of a preceding strip (figure 1 shows three strip overlapping each other and each strip comprises of 5, 4, 3), the masking material being a transparent film, the covering being attached to the first major surface by masking adhesive (inherently being masking adhesive as the adhesive is made to be removed with the masking cover), the masking material being translucent or transparent, the strips being

substantially parallel across the first surface of the pane, the overlapped strips of masking film defining a plurality of exposed lateral edges that form readily accessible means, the strips are affixed to one another by adhesives.

Nagashima et al does not show the first surface having an unmasked peripheral apron, the unmasked apron extends between an outer periphery of the protective covering and an outer periphery of the pane.

Adams Jr. shows the first surface having an unmasked peripheral apron, the unmasked apron extends between an outer periphery of the protective covering and an outer periphery of the pane.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nagashima et al's structure to show first surface having an unmasked peripheral apron, the unmasked apron extends between an outer periphery of the protective covering and an outer periphery of the pane as taught by Adams Jr. because it would enable the pane to be mounted onto a frame without interfering with the film.

4. Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams Jr. (5866260) in view of Hurst (3900102) and Calabrese (2657795) as applied to claimed 1 above and further in view of Bargados et al (5809707)

Adams Jr. et al as modified shows all the claimed limitations except for the covering being sized, shaped, and positioned such that at least one/all peripheral side portion of the covering extending significantly beneath a confronting surface of the frame when the pane is mounted, the peripheral side portions of the covering does not extend so far beneath the confronting surface of the frame as to engage glazing compound between the frame and the pane.

Bargados et al discloses covering (24) being sized, shaped, and positioned such that at least one/all peripheral side portion of the covering extending significantly beneath a confronting surface of the frame(18) when the pane is mounted, the peripheral side portions of the covering does not extend so far beneath the confronting surface of the frame as to engage any glazing compound between the frame and the pane( inherently so as there is no glazing compound), the cover may be able to provide paint resistance.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams Jr. et al's modified structure to show the covering being sized, shaped, and positioned such that at least one/all peripheral side portion of the covering extending significantly beneath a confronting surface of the frame when the pane is mounted, the peripheral side portions of the covering does not extend so far beneath the confronting surface of the frame as to engage glazing compound between the frame and the pane as taught by Bargados et al because it would enable Adam Jr. et al's modified cover to hide the edges of the cover in a groove in the frame as taught by Bargados et al.

5. Claims 48-51,55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams Jr. (5866260) in view of Calabrese (2657795), Bargados et al (5809707) and Emmanuel (5836119).

Adam Jr. et al shows a glazing assembly having a transparent pane (18) and a frame (26) to which the pane is mounted, the frame receives an edge of the pane, the pane having first and second generally opposed major surfaces (20b, 21b), at least one edge received in the frame, the pane having a protective covering (22b) disposed over a portion of the first surface, the first surface having an unmasked apron (the surface not covered) extending between an outer

Art Unit: 3637

periphery of the covering an outer periphery of the pane, the covering consisting of a single sheet of masking material, the masking material being a masking film (transparent layer), the pane being part of a multiple pane insulating glass unit (col 1 lines 49-51), the pane being mounted such that all edges of the pane being received in the frame (figure 5b, 6b), the masking material being flexible.

Adams Jr. et al does not show the protective covering comprising a plurality of strips of masking material, at least one piece of the masking material having at least one/all peripheral side portion extending significantly beneath a confronting surface of the frame, the side portions extending a predetermined distance beneath the confronting surfaces of the frame, a glazing compound between the pane and the frame.

Calabrese discloses a protective covering having a plurality of strips of masking material to cover an unpainted surface.

Bargados et al shows at least one piece of cover material (24) having at least one/all peripheral side portion extending significantly beneath a confronting surface of the frame (18), the side portions extending a predetermined distance beneath the confronting surfaces of the frame, the edges of the covering being inside grooves to hide the edges.

Emmanuel shows a glazing compound (83) connecting the frame and pane together.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adam jr. et al to show the protective covering comprising a plurality of strips of masking material as taught by Calabrese, at least one piece of the masking material having at least one/all peripheral side portion extending significantly beneath a confronting surface of the frame, the side portions extending a predetermined distance beneath the



Art Unit: 3637

confronting surfaces of the frame as taught by Bargados et al, a glazing compound between the pane and the frame as taught by Emmanuel because having the covering made of a plurality of strips would enable easy covering of a large area before painting as taught by Calabrese, having the at least one/all peripheral side portion extending beneath a confronting surface of the frame would enable Adam Jr. et al's cover to hide the edges of the cover in grooves in the frame as taught by Bargados et al, and thus reducing the precise manufacturing tolerance required of the cover, which would result in cost saving and guarantee covering of the exposed central portion of the pane, and having a glazing compound within the frame would enhance the securement of the frame to the pane as taught by Emmanuel.

6. Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams Jr. (5866260) in view of Calabrese (2657795), Bargados et al (5809707), and Emmanuel (5836119).

Adams Jr. (figure 2) shows a glazing assembly comprising an insulating glass unit and a frame to which the insulating glass unit is mounted, the unit comprising first and second panes (col 1 lines 14-16, line 51) having an insulating glass unit (12) and a frame (26) to which the insulating glass unit is mounted, the unit having a first pane (21) having generally opposed inner and outer surfaces, the first pane having at least one edge received in the frame, a protective covering (22) is disposed over a portion of the outer surface of the second pane, the outer surface of the second pane having an unmasked apron extending between an outer periphery of the covering and an outer periphery of the second pane, the covering having at least one piece of masking material (22), the masking material being a flexible masking film.

Adam Jr. does not show the covering comprising a plurality of strips of masking material, glazing compound being located between the frame and the outer surface of the first pane but not

Art Unit: 3637

between the frame and the outer surface of the second pane, the masking material extending beneath a confronting surface of the frame.

Bargados et al shows a covering material extending beneath a confronting surface of the frame (18) to hide the ends of the covering material in the grooves.

Emmanuel (figure 3) shows a window unit having a first and second pane (46, right and left respectively), glazing compound (83) located between the frame and the outer surface of the first pane (46 right) but not between the frame and the outer surface of the second pane (46, left).

Calabrese discloses a covering member being a plurality of strips of masking material.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams Jr. et al to show the covering comprising a plurality of strips of masking material as taught by Calabrese, glazing compound being located between the frame and the outer surface of the first pane but not between the frame and the outer surface of the second pane as taught by Emmanuel, the masking material extending beneath a confronting surface of the frame as taught by Bargados et al because having the cover made of a plurality of strips as taught by Calabrese would enable the covering of the unpainted area before painting, having the glazing compound only between the first panel and the frame but not the second pane and the frame would enhance the securing of the first panel to the frame as taught by Emmanuel, and having the masking material extending beneath a confronting surface of the frame would enable the hiding of the edges of the covering material in the grooves and thus provide complete coverage of the pane from external objects Bargados et al.

Art Unit: 3637

7. Claims 57-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams Jr. (5866260) in view of Calabrese (2657795), Bargados et al (5809707), and Emmanuel (5836119) as applied to claim 56 above and further in view of Hurst (3900102).

Adams Jr. et al as modified shows all the claimed limitations except for the covering having at least one tab or extension to facilitate removing the covering.

Hurst discloses having the covering material overlapping each other to form a continuous covering surface.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams Jr. et al's modified structure to the covering material overlapping each other because it would enable the formation of a continuous surface with strips of covering material.

Adams Jr. as modified shows all the claimed limitations including the covering having at least one tab or extension to facilitate removing the covering.

Per claims 59-60, Adams Jr. et al as modified shows all the claimed limitations except for the distance being at least 1/16 inch and about 1/8 inch.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams Jr. et al's modified structure to show the distance being at least 1/16 inch and about 1/8 inch because it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to show the distance being at least 1/16 inch and about 1/8 inch since applicant has not disclosed that the distance of 1/8 inch or 1/16 inch solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the predetermined distance being

Art Unit: 3637

more than 1/8 inch.; furthermore, a change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

8. Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams Jr. (5866260) in view of Schlicht et al (5123211) in view of Emmanuel (5836119).

Adams Jr. (figure 2) shows a glazing assembly comprising a transparent pane and a frame (26) to which the pane is mounted, the frame being made of wood, the frame receives an edge of the pane, the transparent pane having first and second generally opposed major surfaces, the pane having a protective covering (22) disposed over a portion of the first surface, the first surface having an unmasked apron extending between an outer periphery of the covering and an outer periphery of the pane, the covering comprising at least one piece of masking material, the material being a flexible film.

Adam Jr. does not show the frame comprising the wood being vinyl-covered wood or a tubular construction of metal or metal alloy, glazing compound between the frame and the pane, the masking material extending beneath a confronting surface of the frame but does not extend so far beneath the frame as to engage the glazing compound.

Schlicht et al shows a covering material (44) extending beneath a confronting surface of the frame (figure 12) but does not extend so far beneath the frame as to engage the glazing compound, the frame being made of metal.

Emmanuel (figure 3) shows a window unit having glazing compound (83) located between the frame and the pane.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams Jr. et al to show the glazing compound being located between the

Art Unit: 3637

frame and the first pane as taught by Emmanuel, the masking material extending beneath a confronting surface of the frame but does not extend so far beneath the frame as to engage the glazing compound, the frame being metal alloy as taught by Schlicht et al because having the glazing compound only between the panel and the frame would enhance the securing of the panel to the frame as taught by Emmanuel, and having the masking material extending beneath a confronting surface of the frame without touching the glazing compound would enable the secure hiding of the edges of the covering material in the grooves of the frame as taught by Schlicht et al, and having the frame made of metal as taught by Schlicht et al would form a strong supporting frame for a window.

***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed 2/13/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

10. In response to applicant's argument that Hurst is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the disclosure is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned. Hurst discloses a membrane, which has overlapping strips to cover a surface with a large surface area. Applicant discloses the use of a plurality of overlapping strips to cover a large surface area respectively. Both the strips by Hurst and the strips by applicant, function to provide a protective membrane to a surface. Hurst is thus pertinent and not non-analogous. The argument is thus moot.

With respect to applicant's argument that the combined reference would not show all the claimed limitations of claims 1, 6, 12, 61, examiner respectfully disagrees. As pointed out in the office action above, Adams Jr. et al as modified shows a plurality of exposed lateral edges that form the readily accessible means for removing the protective covering from the window pane, specifically per the teaching of Hurst. Hurst shows the overlapping strips having the claimed lateral edges. Modifying Adams Jr. et al thus shows overlapping masking strips with removable lateral edges. The argument is thus moot.

With respect to Calabrese not showing "sequentially overlapping strips", examiner agrees that the reference only shows the strips being in edge to edge relationship as pointed out by applicant.

With respect to Hurst not showing a film at all and not showing the exposed lateral edges, examiner respectfully points out the following. Adams Jr. et al is the primary reference and Hurst is a secondary reference modifying the primary reference. Hurst is used specifically to teach the sequentially overlapping strips, the adhesive and the exposed lateral edges. Modifying Adams Jr. et with Hurst thus results in Adams Jr. et al having a membrane made of a plurality of sequentially overlapping strips of masking material having exposed lateral edges. Adams Jr. et al's lateral edges as modified certainly can be the readily accessible means as claimed. The argument is thus moot.

With respect to applicant's statement to Calabrese, examiner respectfully states that the reference teaching covering a large area with a plurality of strips. The teaching is consistent with the desired modification, which allows for the covering of a large surface area with a membrane that can be made up of a plurality of strips. The improvement is such that for a large surface

area, there is no need to provide a large membrane, which can be cumbersome to produce. The improvement provides for the use of multiple strips of smaller membrane to cover a large area, and is desired as it is easy to install, produce, and transport. The argument is thus moot.

With respect to applicant's argument to Nagashima and that the coating by Nagashima are not a plurality of strips of masking material, examiner respectfully disagrees. The structures shown by Nagashima read on the limitations as claimed. There is no structural difference between applicant's claimed masking material and those shown by Nagashima. Applicant states that since Nagashima shows the film coatings being an integral part of the panels, they cannot be masking material, examiner respectfully sets forth that the structures 3-5 shown by Nagashima can function as claimed and thus is properly interpreted. The argument is thus moot.

Claims 8-11 are rejected as they re depended upon a rejected claim 1.

With respect to Bargados, applicant states that Bargados does not show the window guard 24 does not extend beneath the disclosed frame 14, examiner respectfully sets forth that as rejected above, part 18 is the frame, and the member 24 certainly extend beneath the disclosed frame. The frame (18) and the covering 24 were clearly set forth in the last office and repeated above. The reference shows the limitations as claimed. combining the references thus result in a structure that read on the claimed limitations. The argument is thus moot.

With respect to claim 56, examiner respectfully points out that Adams Jr. as modified shows at least one peripheral side portion of the protective covering extending beneath a confronting surface of the frame, per the teaching of Bargados. Secondly, as pointed out in the action set forth above, Emmanuel shows the compound 83 between the frame and the outer surface of the right pane but not between the frame and outer surface of the second pane.

Emmanuel shows a first compound 83 left, and a right compound 83 right. The compounds are separated and not one piece. The reference thus shows a compound (either left or right) that is between the frame and the outer surface of the right pane but not between the frame and outer surface of the second pane as claimed. the argument is thus moot.

Claims 57-60 are rejected as they are depended form rejected claim 56.

11. In response to applicant's argument that Schlicht is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the reference teaches the covering of a glass panel with a covering membrane. It is pertinent to applicant's invention. Schlicht teaching the temporary attachment of a membrane 22 to a glass surface, which is exactly what applicant is doing. The argument is thus moot.

12. In response to applicant's argument that Schlicht is non-analogous as it has a different intended use, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. The argument is thus moot.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phi D A whose telephone number is 571-272-6864. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday, Thursday and Friday.



Art Unit: 3637

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on 571-272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Phi Dieu Tran A', with a large, stylized loop at the end.

Phi Dieu Tran A

5/15/06